

Counterproductive Work Behaviors in Higher Educational Institutions

Jollie N. Alson, Jeanne Felice Bren C. Porras, Ma. Angelica L. Sabado,
Edmirenza C. Tandang

Email address: jnalseduc@yahoo.com.ph, Jeanneporras0628@gmail.com, sbdangelica@gmail.com, iamangel.014@gmail.com

Abstract— This aims to broaden the knowledge of academic managers in Higher Educational Institutions (HEI's) on counterproductive work behaviors (CWB) that may be detrimental to the organization, assigned jobs and colleagues. This descriptive research approach was anchored on the theory of Chernyak-Hai and Tziner (2014). The study was conducted from June to September 2018 in the two campuses of University of Perpetual Help System DALTA. The quantitative data gathered from Academic Deans and Department using two-sets of survey questionnaire were analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics with the aid of Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS).

Counterproductive work behaviors were very minimal during the three-month duration of the study. Negligible overt manifestations of isolated misbehaviors were noticed by the respondents. These are not enough however to officially call the attention of their subordinates. Respondents further averred that counterwork behaviors that are directed towards colleagues surfaced and becomes observable after series of which were committed in the past. These actions which most of the time originate from interpersonal relationships are not apparent until they become serious, and consequently affect assigned tasks and the organization. The study further affirmed that there exist no significant differences in the counterproductive work behaviors among genders. Significant relationship however was apparent between number of years in service of the employees and counterproductive work behavior directed towards the organization. The teaching personnel has greater tendency to manifest counterproductive work behaviors as they stay longer with the institution.

Keywords— Counterproductive behaviors, personnel in HEI's, assigned tasks, educational managers.

I. INTRODUCTION

Companies have continuously searched on how they can improve employee retention and keep up with providing an excellent workplace that would encourage productive workers. Organizations set attention to provide benefits and compensation for hardworking and dedicated employees. It cannot be denied however, that there are unproductive workers. Their actions, behavior and practices has impact on organizational integrity and culture. Recent studies on counterproductive work behaviors (CWB) have shown the seriousness of the threat to both the employees and organizations including institutions (Ching, 2017). According to Nevins-Bennett (2016), it is alarming that there exist in educational work environment a growing practice to engage in theft, organizational fraud, high absenteeism, verbal abuse and decrease in work-time. These behavioral practices are unacceptable in any organization. In academic institutions

educators are known to be professionals and are expected to be role-models and exhibit exceptional work attitudes.

Counterproductive work behaviors (CWB) (Hollinger & Clark, 1983; Sackett & Devore, 2001) are deviant and serious offenses which can be in form of theft, fraud, drug use, anything illegal and immoral. These voluntary behaviors violate significant organizational norms and have strong potentials to directly or indirectly threaten the well-being of an organization due to decreased productivity, increased cost, inefficient workforce (Nasir & Bashir, 2012).

There are five classifications of work behaviors according to McShane & Von Glinow (2015) that are counterproductive in nature: abuse of others (insults and nasty comments), threats (threatening harm), work avoidance (tardiness), work sabotage (doing work incorrectly) and overt acts (theft). Employee Assistance Program in University of Missouri (Hunter, James 2011) takes precautionary actions to counterproductive work behavior such as coaching, mediation, disciplinary action and organizational consultation.

Hu and her colleagues (2015), distinguished Taiwan schools between minor CWB which are the common ones and the major which are very serious. In a study conducted on the secondary teachers in Nigeria (Salami, 2015) two crucial predictors for CWB are work related stress and negative affectivity.

The researchers conducted the study to broaden the understanding of CWB so that counter measures may be applied. Reduction of occurrences in the three campuses of the University of Perpetual Help System DALTA in the Philippines an academic institution where more than fifteen thousand (15,000) students' future are mold and honed holistically can significantly improve the realization of its vision.

II. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

The study is anchored on the study of Chernyak-Hai and Tziner (2014) on destructive behavior within the workplace as harmful to organizational functioning. The determinants of counterproductive work behaviors are focused on three general categories: a). Individual Traits - that can also be personality traits or cognitive abilities; b). Organizational Conditions - the work and the work environment itself; c). Interaction between personal factors and organizational conditions. Employees' counterproductive work behaviors are not just from their own volition, it can emanate from the job itself. It can also proceed from the working environment when

the company does not strictly implement policies that allows them to behave what they wanted.

Counterproductive work behavior are work-related behaviors as identified by McShane and Von Glinow (2015). While most of the work-related behavior shows positive attitude of employees, counterproductive work behavior can negatively impact an organization. In the study of Ching, et al. (2016), there were moderate occurrence of negative behaviors in academic institutions in Taiwan. The reinforcement of awareness within the school was an imperative move in order to be prevent any further damage. Feldman, Lam and Ng (2016) paved the way of studying the role of gender and their notable differences in counterproductive work behavior. The study suggests that there is very little observation on the relationship of gender and perspective of social role theory when speaking of counterproductive work behavior. It concludes that males' roles – being more focused in their career and work – has prevented them from committing such kind of unfavorable behavioral practices.

The study analyzes the counterproductive work behavior among employees of UPHSD Calamba and Molino Campuses, to further dig on some factors that could be prevalent in committing these counterproductive practices.

Social Exchange Theory (SET), (Chernyak-Hai and Tziner, 2014) is used to understand workplace behavior because it explains the employee interaction toward his colleagues and the work itself.

Research Design

The researchers employed quantitative method using descriptive approach. The research described and measured the different counterproductive work behaviors of employees using descriptive statistics. This study was conducted in the two campuses of the University of Perpetual Help System DALTA, Philippines in the provinces of Laguna and Cavite. Total numeration of the academic deans and department heads of Calamba and Molino campuses was used, 19 out of 26 or 73% and 15 out of 31 or 48% of the known population from the teaching and non-teaching participated in the study respectively.

Survey questionnaire was the main instrument in determining the counterproductive work behaviors of employees. The instrument was developed by Professor Paul E. Spector but edited to suit the research needs and locale.

Description of the Respondents

Respondents comprised of 26 male respondents or 46.6% and 30 female or 53.6%. Respondent-department heads were 30 or 53.6%; respondent-deans were 23 or 41.1% while supervisor and director positions comprised 3.6% and 1.8% respectively.

Respondents who have stayed with the institution for the last three years were 22 or 39.3%. While respondents whose tenure ranges from 4-6 years 14 respondents and percentage equivalent to 25%, 6-7 were 6 or 10.7% and those who have been in institution for more than 8 years were 14 of 25%.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

On Counterproductive work behavior against the organization.

It appeared that there been very negligible occurrences that employees had done counterproductive work behavior against the organization. It can be interpreted however that there are counterproductive acts committed in the workplace like *telling other people about their lousy workplace, show rude behavior to a client or student and purposely wasted the employer's materials and supplies*. However workers tend to give an ample amount of respect for fellow workers to correct themselves for the welfare of the institution that helps them provide for their needs. While it may be negligible and appears normal for complaining and telling people about a lousy workplace (WM 1.41) Naharuddin (2013), affirmed that workplace affects employees' productivity that may be overtly manifested through rude behaviors to clients. It further stated that the component of physical work environment must be appreciative so that employees could not be unduly stressed while doing their duties and responsibilities.

Workers normally do not report such counterproductive behaviors to their immediate supervisor or *Failing to report a problem until it gotten worse* (WM1.43). This behavior of employees at the university is in consonance with the study of Kessler (2007), that in an academic institution, usually employees don not immediately report problems to supervisors due to the fact that the roots of the said behavior is often mistreatment among employees. It further stated that 36% of faculty members and staff experienced mistreatment from colleagues and 72% experienced it from their immediate supervisor or department head. This had led to situations of apathy and mistrust where problems have to get worse before they will be brought to the attention of person who can abate the situation or has the authority to decide for the solution.

On Counterproductive work behaviors that contravene job description

The study measured thirteen (13) different possible behaviors. Coming to work late without permission ranked first. Employees have been late for work at least twice a month. Although this is a common occurrence among employees, especially with the current situation of traffic in the Philippines and where every day is a struggle to take the public transport to work. With current technology, it is still however a very laudable gesture on the part of the employee to inform the immediate supervisor in cases wherein coming to work late becomes unavoidable. In a survey conducted by Ilac and Salvosa (2012), from several industrial, academic, government and non-profit organizations in the Philippines, amongst the sixty (60) individuals who participated in their study, tardiness is the most prevalent counterproductive work behavior. Participants of the study further attested the everyday drama in witnessing the queue of vehicles rushing to their workplace that bring about unimaginable traffic congestion.

Deliberately doing the task slowly is another counterproductive behavior that administrators should be

concerned. Although there is an observable efforts for some to commit less error and avoiding doing the work again, there exist an equally undesirable traits for some employees while complaining about insignificant things at work to intentionally finish the job beyond the time allotted for them. It is notable that pretending to be sick, purposely doing the work incorrectly and sleeping during work hours appeared to be the least counterproductive behaviors among employees.

On Counterproductive work behavior against colleagues

Filipino workers are very considerate and loving with their co-workers. They have the tendency to unite and even defend each other against their immediate supervisor. This behavior may spell different among workers especially those that are working in Western countries. According to Jocano F. Landa (2012), a Filipino anthropologist, when compared to the Westerners, Filipino values their workmates and treat them as their friend to a point that the relationships go beyond from being professionals and already affecting even personal lives. Most Filipinos tend to keep close ties, good interpersonal relationship and treat their colleagues as *an extended family in the workplace*. It is even observed that Filipinos are prone to be more productive and motivated as long as they are working by groups of people they can talk to and bond with or by being a member of a team even after working hours.

There is however a high tendency among them to swift on to blaming someone at work for the error they made and this can easily start an argument with someone at work. Although there had been a few reported cases of counterproductive work behavior against colleagues, this happens when someone who is blamed on the immediately point out fingers to another who should be accountable for the errors that were found.

Jovial atmosphere in the Pilipino workplace which may manifested through cracking a jokes that makes fun of someone's personal life. There are employees who tend to be too nosy about someone else's personal life. This often leads to unproductivity especially when they cannot draw a boundary between personal life and work life, Jocano F. Landa (2012),

Finally, the least counterproductive work behavior and appeared to have never occurred in the workplace against colleagues were showing obscene gesture (the finger) to someone at work and hit or pushed someone at work. Workers in this academic institution showed very high level of respect on individuality and project an image of high professionalism.

Further analysis, with the computed p-values set at .05 level of significance, there exists no Counterproductive Work Behaviors significant differences among genders: between the Organization, Job Description and Colleagues. However, there exists significant differences in the counterproductive work behaviors between teaching and non-teaching personnel. The frequency of committing counterproductive behaviors cuts through genders, however, being a teaching and non-teaching personnel (employees) and the number of years in the institution affects the tendency and the frequency to engage into counterproductive work behaviors.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

1. Employees tend to be unconcern on some problems at the workplace until they become seriously affecting interpersonal relationships and work processes.
2. Employees have enough time for personal concerns even at work. Some need to be extra motivated to go to work to neutralize the current traffic situation in the Philippines.
3. Male and female employees have similar counterproductive work behaviors.
4. Teaching employees who stayed longer in the institution have higher tendency of committing counterproductive work behaviors.

V. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. A regular teambuilding activity may spearheaded by the Human Resource Department to avoid building up of unhealthy work environment and unnecessary conflict would be abated.
2. Due recognition must be given to every employee who positively and quantitatively contribute to a better workplace.
3. Conduct periodic orientation for all employees on leadership and institutional direction.

REFERENCES

- [1] Babble, Earl R. *The Practice of Social Research*. 12th ed. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Cengage, 2010.
- [2] Burke, Mary Elizabeth and Esen, Evren. *Workplace Productivity Poll Findings*. United States of America. Society for Human Resource Management. 2004
- [3] Chernyak-Hai, Lily & Tziner, Aharon (2014). Relationships between counterproductive work behavior, perceived justice and climate, occupational status, and leader-member exchange. *Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*.1-12. <http://dx.doi.org/105091/tr2014a1>
- [4] Ching, Gregory S., Tsay, Wen-Rong, Hu, Yueh-Luen, Hung, Chao-Hsiang. *Counterproductive work behaviors within academic institutions: A myth or a reality*. *International Journal of Research Studies in Psychology*. 2017; Vol. 6 1-14, DOI: 10.5861/ijrsp.2016.1629
- [5] Feldman, Daniel C., Lam, Simon. S.K. & Ng, Thoman W.H. (2016). Organizational citizenship behavior and counterproductive work behavior: Do males and females differ?. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*. 93, 11-12. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2015.12.005>
- [6] Gruys, M.L. and Sackett, P.R. "Investigating the dimensionality of counterproductive work behaviour," *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, (11:1), March 2003, pp. 30-42.
- [7] Hollinger, R. C. & Clark, J. P. (1983). Deterrence in the workplace: Perceived certainty, perceived severity, and employee theft. *Social Forces*, 62(2), 398-418.
- [8] Hu, Y.-L., Hung, C.-H., & Ching, G. S. (2015). Examining the counterproductive work behaviors within Taiwan academic setting: A pilot study. *Higher Education Evaluation and Development*, 9(1), 63-82. <http://dx.doi.org/10.6197/HEED.2015.0901.04>
- [9] Hunter, James. University of Missouri – Employee Assistance Program (FY 2010 - 2011). The Curators of the University of Missouri
- [10] Ilac, Emerald Jay D. and Salvosa, Helen. *Understanding the Filipino Worker and Organization*. Quezon City, Philippines. Ateneo de Manila University Press. 2012
- [11] Instone, Karin (2012). *Counterproductive Work Behaviour*
- [12] Kaifi, Belai A. & Noori, Selaiman A. (2011). Organizational Behavior: A study of managers, employees and teams. *Journal of Management Policy and Practice*. Vol. 12 (1)
- [13] Kessler, Stacey R. "The effects of organizational structure on faculty job performance, job satisfaction, and counterproductive work behavior" (2007). <http://scholarcommons.usf.edu/etd/2243>



- [14] McShane, Steven L. & Von Glinow, Mary Ann. "Organizational Behavior." N.Y. New York, Mc-Graw Hill Education (Asia), 2015
- [15] Naharuddin, Nina Munira and Sadegi, Mohammad (2013). Factors of Workplace
- [16] Environment that affect employee's performance: A Case study of Miyazu Malaysia. *International Journal of Independent Research and Studies – IJIRS*, 2(2), 66-78
- [17] Nevins-Bennett, C. (2016). Counterproductive Work Behaviour among Academic and Administrative Staff and Its effective on the Organizational Effectiveness *Advances in Social Sciences Research Journal*, 3(2)29B41.
- [18] Productivity in Higher Education: Research insights for universities and governments in Asia. Tokyo, Japan: Asian Productivity Organization. 2017
- [19] Spector, P. E., Fox, S., Penney, L. M., Bruursema, K., Goh, A., & Kessler, S. (2006). The dimensionality of counterproductivity: Are all counterproductive behaviors created equal? *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 68(3), 446-460. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2005.10.005>
- [20] Tangen, Stefan. (2018). Understanding the Concept of Productivity. *ThermoFisher Scientific*.
- [21] Von Rosenstiel Lutz (2011): Employee behavior in organizations: On the current state of research, *Management Revue*, ISSN 1861-9916, Hampp, Mering, Vol.22, Iss.4 pp. 344366, http://dx.doi.org/10.1688/1861-9908_mrev_2011_04_Rosenstiel